UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF MINNESOTA

Lucila Martinez-Vivanco,

Case No. 23-cv-1853 (WMW/DLM)

Petitioner,

v.

ORDER

Warden, FCI Waseca,

Defendant.

Before the Court is Petitioner Lucila Martinez-Vivanco's "Motion to Expediate and Rule on Appeal Immed[i]ately," (Dkt. 12), and her application to proceed *in forma pauperis* ("IFP") on appeal, (Dkt. 16). For the reasons addressed below, the motion titled "Motion to Expediate and Rule on Appeal Immed[i]ately" is denied and the application to proceed IFP on appeal is granted.

I. Motion for Reconsideration

Martinez-Vivanco filed a motion titled "Motion to Expediate and Rule on Appeal Immed[i]ately." (Dkt. 12.) In liberally interpreting Martinez-Vivanco's *pro se* motion, the Court concludes that Martinez-Vivanco moves the Court to reconsider the Court's September 26, 2023. *See Erickson v. Pardus*, 551 U.S. 89, 94 (2007) (A document filed *pro se* is "to be liberally construed"). A party is not permitted to file a motion to reconsider without first obtaining the district court's permission based on a showing of "compelling circumstances." LR 7.1(j). "Motions for reconsideration serve a limited function: to correct manifest errors of law or fact or to present newly discovered evidence." *Hagerman*

v. Yukon Energy Corp., 839 F.2d 407, 414 (8th Cir. 1988) (internal quotation marks omitted). The purpose of a motion to reconsider is to afford a party the "opportunity for relief in extraordinary circumstances." Clear Channel Outdoor, Inc. v. City of Saint Paul, 642 F. Supp. 2d 902, 909 (D. Minn. 2009) (internal quotation marks omitted). The decision to grant a party leave to file a motion to reconsider rests within the district court's discretion. Hagerman, 839 F.2d at 413.

Martinez-Vivanco contends that "compelling circumstances" warrant a motion to reconsider because the Court committed a manifest error of law by not considering her petition. United States Magistrate Judge Douglas L. Micko issued a Report and Recommendation ("R&R"), recommending that this matter be dismissed as duplicative. Martinez-Vivanco was provided a period to object to the R&R, but she did not do so. After conducting a review for clear error, the Court adopted the R&R on September 26, 2023. Martinez-Vivanco does not argue that the R&R was incorrect, nor does she provide any reason for her lack of an objection to the R&R. The Court, therefore, concludes that "compelling circumstances" do not exist that warrant reconsideration.

II. Application to Proceed In Forma Pauperis on Appeal

Martinez-Vivanco has applied to proceed *in forma pauperis* on appeal. This Court concludes that Martinez-Vivanco qualifies financially for IFP status and as a prisoner with "no assets and no means by which to pay [an] initial partial filing fee." 28 U.S.C. § 1915(b)(4). Although the Court continues to believe that Martinez-Vivanco's action was correctly dismissed, the Court concludes that her appeal is not frivolous as the U.S. Supreme Court has defined that term. *See Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319, 325 (1989)

CASE 0:23-cv-01853-WMW-DLM Doc. 17 Filed 12/12/23 Page 3 of 3

(stating that an appeal "is frivolous when it lacks an arguable basis either in law or in fact").

Accordingly, Martinez-Vivanco's IFP application is granted.

Based on the foregoing analysis and all the files, records and proceedings herein, IT

IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

1. Petitioner Lucila Martinez-Vivanco's "Motion to Expediate and Rule on

Appeal Immed[i]ately," (Dkt. 12), is **DENIED**.

2. The application to proceed *in forma pauperis* on appeal of Petitioner Lucila

Martinez-Vivanco, (Dkt. 16), is **GRANTED**.

3. The initial partial filing fee of \$90.86 for the appeal in this matter is due

immediately.

4. Martinez-Vivanco is required to pay the remaining balance of \$414.14, the

statutory filing fee prescribed by 28 U.S.C. § 1915(b)(2), and the Clerk of Court is ordered

to provide notice of this requirement to authorities at the institution where Martinez-

Vivanco is confined.

Dated: December 12, 2023

s/Wilhelmina M. Wright

Wilhelmina M. Wright

United States District Judge

3